

IS IT TOO LATE NOW TO SAY SORRY? – THE LANGUAGE OF PUBLIC APOLOGIES IN THE CONTEXTS OF AMERICAN AND PHILIPPINE TELEVISION

By

JOHN PAUL O. DELA ROSA *

LORNA B. CASTRO **

* Ph.D Scholar, Department of Applied Linguistics, Philippine Normal University, Manila, Philippines.

** Secondary School English Teacher I, Department of Education, Dapdap High School, Province of Tarlac, Philippines.

ABSTRACT

This pragmatic study of the speech act of apology aims to look into the apology strategies and felicity conditions fulfilled in the public apology statements of an American and a Filipino TV host after alleged faults done during the pageant nights of Miss Universe 2015 and Binibining Pilipinas 2015, respectively. Specifically, the study purposes to establish similarities and differences between the apology strategies and felicity conditions employed in both American and Filipino public apologies. It was found that the American TV host provided a more direct apology expression as compared to the more intensified expression of the Filipino TV host. On the basis of the apology strategies used, the American TV host made emphasis on self-blame, self-embarrassment, and on a more empathetic type of apology. On the other hand, the Filipino TV host made her apology more self-justifying which highlights explicit lack of intent and denial of self-responsibility. As regards felicity conditions, the apology statement of the American TV host is more felicitous than that of the Filipino TV host. The emergence of less common apology strategies was also traced from the statement of the Filipino TV host-the transfer of guilt towards the "apologizee" and the expression of gratitude to a certain group of people to counter the negative impact of the mistake or fault committed.

Keywords: Speech Act of Apology, Public Apologies, Apology Strategies, Felicity Conditions.

INTRODUCTION

The pioneering concept of contemporary Speech Act Theory was first conceived by John Austin in his book, "How to Do Things with Words", published in 1962. In this seminal work, he presented a major premise that features language as a mode of action and as a means of conveying information. On one hand, another founding father, John Searle, affirmed the idea that linguistic communication involves linguistic acts. Its unit does not depend on the symbol, word, or sentence or even the token that embodies such elements. He evidently underscored that such unit is dependent on the production or issuance of the symbol or word or sentence in the performance of a speech act. Hence, the illocutionary act or speech act that ushered in novel conceptions about pragmatics, a sub-field of linguistics that studies how people comprehend and produce

messages in concrete speech situations, became one of the highlights of current researches in socio linguistics. To note, beyond pragmatics, the notion of speech acts is used in syntax and semantics, in literature and cinema studies, in ethics and epistemology, in clinical and experimental psychology, and the list could be continued for a long time (Kissine, 2014). The pragmatic purpose of speech acts lead to the knowledge of how they can be appropriately used within the culture that embodies important social relationships.

The Speech Act of Apology

From the classic song of Elton John (1976), 'Sorry Seems to be the Hardest Word' to the utterly popular rendition of Justin Bieber (2015) of 'Sorry', it is certain that to ask for forgiveness through apologizing is inherent to humans. In its practical sense, apologizing is the first step towards reconciliation. Not only does it improve relationships and

make people feel better, but saying sorry helps the addresser feel better, too (Mamiverse.com, 2015). Jacobsson (2002) describes apologizing as one of the speech acts in human language, which has attracted the attention of scholars dealing with social and cultural patterns in language.

Olshtain and Cohen (1983) define the speech act of apology as a kind of social event that takes place when the norms of a society are broken. This was then supported by Bergman & Kasper (1993) as they claim that an apology aims at re-establishing social harmony after a commitment of an offense. Further, when an action or utterance has resulted in the fact that one or more persons perceive themselves as offended, the culpable persons need to apologize. The speech act itself involves two parties - the "apologizer" and the "apologizee." However, only if the apologizer admits that he committed something off beam does one gets the fulfillment of the act of apologizing. Thus, apologizing requires an action or an utterance which is intended to "set things right" (Olshtain, 1989). Many researchers in the field gave varying descriptions of how apologizing and an apology itself are realized as a communicative act. According to Marquez-Reiter (2000), an apology is a compensatory action for an offense committed by the speaker which has affected the hearer. Goffman (1959) views apologies as remedial acts used to regain harmony in a society after an offense has been committed. An apology for Holmes (1990) is a speech act that is used as a remedy for an offense for which the offender is responsible, and thus social harmony is regained between the interactions.

The speech act of apology is also relative in many languages. Apology, along with request and refusal, has been largely investigated in recent pragmatic studies in a variety of languages, and in comparison with English in particular (Al Ali, 2012). Some of these studies on apologizing were conducted in the distinct speech communities of countries in which the native languages are Hebrew, Hungarian, Italian, Thai, Danish, Cantonese, Korean, Spanish, French, and other varieties of English such as those spoken in the United Kingdom and Australia. These studies on the speech act of apology reveal that

the cross-cultural differences in the way apology is perceived seem to be less salient than the way the speech act of request is perceived. As such, people from different languages will perceive the speech act of apology similarly in situations where the social factors are on the same level (Trosborg, 1995).

To be able to make analysis of the mechanisms of speech act theories, researchers identified a number of strategies. As such, the apologizer can choose from such strategies to perform an apology. Goffman (1959) states that for an apology to be successful, the apologizer has to consider three factors: acknowledgement of an offense, taking responsibility for the offense, and offering compensation. Olshtain and Cohen (1983), who established the notion of the speech act set of apology present five apology strategies – Illocutionary Force Indicating Devices (IFIDs) or formulaic expressions, taking on responsibility, explanation or account, offer of repair, and promise of forbearance.

When the offender intends to offer a verbal apology, he/she uses one or a combination of the above-mentioned strategies. Also, offenders can intensify or downgrade their apologies in addition to those apologies (Al Ali, 2012). Olshtain (1989) states that the intensifiers that are most common in use are 'very' and 'really', while the expression of 'I'm sorry', for example, is considered to be a common manifestation that the offender intends to use to reduce the apology. In addition, there are other sets of apology strategies presented by other researchers such as Fraser (1981) and Trosborg (1987).

Felicity Conditions

Apologizing is an expressive speech act which speakers attempt to show their current state and attitude (Bataineh & Bataineh, 2005). Consequently, in order for an apology to have an effect, it should reflect genuine feelings. Searle (1979) states that a person who apologizes for doing something must express regret at having done such in order for the apologizee to recognize the act as positively true and sincere. With this obligatory element, it can be drawn out that such important conditions could gauge the sincerity of the apology given.

Felicity conditions have to be satisfied so that

performative acts will be successful (Dinu, 2012). Austin (1962), on the other hand, claims that unlike constative utterances, performative utterances do not depend on truth conditions in order to be meaningful, but on certain appropriateness or felicity conditions. He distinguishes these felicity conditions into three - (1) There must be a conventional procedure having a conventional effect; (2) The circumstances and persons must be appropriate, as specified in the procedure; and (3) The procedure must be executed correctly and completely. Hence, violation of any of the felicity conditions results in a performative 'unhappy' or infelicitous performative or a 'misfire'. Further, he formulates a sincerity condition, specifying that the person must have the requisite thoughts, feelings and intentions as specified in the procedure. If the sincerity condition was violated, there is a case of what Austin (1962) calls as an 'abuse'. Nevertheless, felicitous speech acts are said to be necessary, if one wants to sound genuine before the person he is performing any speech act with. In the latter part of the paper, the conditions to be fulfilled to qualify an apology as felicitous are presented.

Cross-Cultural Studies on Apologizing

Cross-cultural studies about apologizing as a speech act have brought research interests to the field of sociolinguistics, with special attention given to pragmatics as a sub-field. As Trosborg (1987) claims, a considerable body of research in pragmatics has investigated the speech act of apology in different languages, putting into consideration a number of variables employed such as the strategies used by native and non-native speakers of English.

One of the most cited works on speech acts is the Cross-Cultural Study of Speech Act Realization Patterns (CCSARP), which is considered to be a seminal work in speech act realization (Al Ali, 2012). This work involved the speech acts of requests and apologies and its purpose was to investigate how native speakers realize these acts and discover any similarities and differences between native speakers and non-native speakers in their realization of these two acts (Blum-Kulka, 1984). The Discourse Completion Test (DCT) was used in collecting the data for the study. The investigation of this work focused on eight

languages: Australian English, American English, British English, Canadian-French, Danish, German, Hebrew and Russian. The results showed that participants from different groups used similar strategies and those cultural preferences influenced their use. For most of the participants, the main components of an apology were explicit apology expressions and accounts (Blum-Kulka, House & Kasper, 1989b).

A more current study of apologizing was done by Istifci (2009) in Turkey. The study investigated the act of apologizing with subjects from two different levels of English proficiency to find out whether there are similarities and differences between these groups and whether they approach the native speaker apology norms. The analysis of the data followed Cohen & Olshtain's (1981) apology speech act. On the reference of the setting where the research was conducted, a Turkish academic setting, it was concluded that the participants' L1 (Turkish), had direct influence on their use of apologies, especially among intermediate level subjects who transferred native speaker norms into English. This research puts forward the culture-specific nature of the speech act of apology.

Al Ali (2012) investigated the apology made by female Saudi native Arabic speakers and female Australian native English speakers. The study recruited 40 participants of University students and a few staff members. It further looked into the differences in the apology strategies employed by Arabic speakers and Australian native speakers. This study has shown that there were some similarities as well as significant differences between the Saudi (SA) and Australian (AU) females in terms of their use of apology strategies. Also, a number of features were utilized by the SA and AU groups in their use of apology strategies. The SA use of these features reflected some aspects of their religion and cultural traditions and provided valuable insights into the Saudi daily practice of apology. Moreover, this study has found that the SA and AU groups realized apology strategies sometimes similarly, and other times differently. Overall, culture played a major role in influencing the two groups' behavior in the act of apology.

Another cross-cultural study on the use of apologies was

done by Oclaret (2013). He specifically investigated the apology strategies Filipino and Filipino-Chinese high school students prefer to use in certain contrived situations. Significant differences on their choice of apology strategies were also determined. Results revealed that Filipino-Chinese students resorted to fewer strategies in apologizing in comparison with their Filipino counterparts. In addition, Filipino-Chinese students tend to use combinations of more than two expressions of apology than Filipino students. Finally, it was found in the study that there is a relationship between social distance and the apology strategy used by the participants. Hence, as the level of directness increases, the closer the social distance between the interlocutors.

Public Apologies

Public Apologies are one of the most prominent examples of migration of a speech act from the private to the public sphere and are now used in a range of public settings (Ancarno, 2011). Often, people witness public apologies done by famous politicians or of a showbiz personality whose name was sensationalized because of a recent disgrace, outrage, or indignation committed towards another person. Hence, these people who use media as a platform for popularity do public apologies in order to protect a 'good' image and appear as congenial and munificent before the people who may idolize or critique them in the silver screen. When celebrities have actually done something to marginalize, unfairly discriminate or mistreat a group of people – say women, gays, Black people or in other cases, their own families (such as what happened with Tiger Woods when he was proven guilty of having an affair with another woman) – they find refuge from the potential benefits of public apologies. When these apologies are done publicly, the main question that needs to be answered is, "How felicitous are these apologizers in 'performing' what they give as apologies?".

For Cunningham (1999), the issue of sincerity is at the heart of public apology processes. If sincere and accepted as such by the recipients, a public apology is successful. A significant aspect of emotions in public apologies, however, is that they are not (and cannot) always be genuinely felt by the public figures who apologize. This

typically applies to historical apologies, where the public apologizer is perhaps more concerned with the display of emotion rather than genuinely felt emotions. Further, public apologies are sometimes defined as an essentially moral act (Nobles, 2003). In some ways, this implies that apologizers perceived as adhering to the moral standards of society are likely to enhance the felicity chances of their apologetic performance and reduce the likelihood of their apology being rejected. Cunningham (1999) states that public figures who seek social inclusion in the way they perform, deliver, and frame their apologies, may be enhancing the felicity chances of their apologies.

From the studies conducted and the prevailing interests toward unearthing the speech act phenomenon of apologizing, there is therefore a need to look into how it occurs in public apologies, where television personalities are involved. The study is also a response to the growing need for cross-cultural studies involving the distinct ways by which people from contrasting discourse communities express their apologies. Further, most of the methods used to study the apology strategies across cultures are too contrived that participants would only respond to open-ended questions to identify predominant apology strategies. In the present study, spontaneous speeches or naturally occurring utterances, produced in actual, realistic settings were analyzed to arrive at a clear picture of how apologizing behaves in the contexts of American and Philippine television. Studying felicity conditions that constitute a sincere and a meaningful apology would also help sociolinguists and other researchers come up with an in-depth description of apologizing as a speech act. Hence, this study would add to the initiative of supporting the conceptions of the Speech Act Theory in general.

1. Objectives of the Study

The purpose of this pragmatic study is to look into the apology strategies and felicity conditions employed in two actual public apologies done by an American and a Filipino TV host to compensate unmerited situations incurred during two different pageant competitions held in the United States and the Philippines. Establishing

comparable elements on the way public apologies are performed in the American and Philippine television contexts was also put forth in this study. Specifically, it sought answers to the following research questions:

1. What apology expressions were used in the public apology statements given by the American and Filipino TV hosts after alleged faults committed during the coronation nights of Miss Universe 2015 and Binibining Pilipinas 2015?
2. What apology strategies were employed by the American TV host and the Filipino TV host in trying to make up on the faults they committed? What significant similarities and differences could be drawn from their apology strategies?
3. What felicity conditions were fulfilled in the public apologies made by the American TV host and the Filipino TV host?

Categories	Example Expression
A. Illocutionary Form Indicating Device (IFID)	
1. An expression of regret	"I'm sorry."
2. An offer of apology	"I apologize."
3. A request for forgiveness	"Excuse me," "Pardon me" "Forgive me"
B. Explanation or account, an excuse or justification	"The traffic was terrible"
C. Taking on responsibility	
1. Explicit self-blame	"It's my fault/my mistake."
2. Lack of intent	"I didn't mean it."
3. Expression of self-deficiency	"I was confused/I didn't see you/ I forgot."
4. Expression of embarrassment	"I feel awful about it."
5. Self-dispraise	"I'm such a silly person."
6. Refusal to acknowledge guilt	
6.1 Denial of responsibility	"It wasn't my fault."
6.2 Blame the hearer	"It's your own fault."
6.3 Pretend to be offended	"I'm the one to be offended."
D. Concern for the hearer	"I hope I did not upset you."
E. Offer of repair	"I'll pay for the damage."
F. Promise of forbearance	"It won't happen again."
G. Intensification (use of adverbials like 'very' with the IFID and the repetition of the IFID)	I'm (so/very/really/terribly/awfully/ deeply) sorry/ I'm sorry. Please forgive me.

Table 1. Framework for Apology Strategies
(Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984)

Felicity Conditions	Description
Propositional Content Condition	The speaker's utterance contains polite expressions.
Preparatory Condition	The apologized act should be morally wrong.
Sincerity Condition	The speaker must not want the apologized act to happen again.
Essential Condition	The speaker undertakes to inform a bad event.

Table 2. Framework for Felicity Conditions on the Speech Act of Apologizing (Searle, 1980 as cited in Tourni, 2010)

2. Frameworks of the Study

This study made use of two frameworks to analyze the apology strategies and felicity conditions that are in the public apology statements of the American and Filipino TV hosts of aired beauty pageant coronation nights. They were adopted from the existing frameworks designed by the researchers who also conducted studies on the speech act of apology.

2.1 Framework for Apology Strategies (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984)

This framework is almost a rearrangement of the set of strategies proposed by Olshtain & Cohen in 1983. Blum-Kulka & Olshtain (1984) provide five verbs – regret, excuse, be sorry, forgive, pardon – besides 'apologize' which they consider as performative verbs in English and hence Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFID, hereinafter). Basic categories and example expressions are given in Table 1.

2.2 Felicity Conditions on the Speech Act of Apology (Searle, 1980 as cited in Tourni, 2010)

Searle (1980) explains that the essential condition in performing speech acts requires the commitment of speakers and hearers to do the actions which are expressed by their utterances. To analyze felicity conditions, Searle (1980), as cited in the study of Tourni (2010), categorized felicity conditions for several speech acts such as apologizing. Table 2 presents how apologizing could be analyzed on the basis of categories that satisfy felicity conditions.

3. Method

3.1 Study Corpus

The corpora used in this study were taken from actual apology statements of two celebrities who served as hosts of a globally recognized beauty pageant (Miss Universe)

and a national beauty pageant in the Philippines (Binibining Pilipinas). Videos of public apologies from the two pageant hosts were downloaded from Youtube.com, a Google company where originally-created videos can be discovered, shared, and viewed by billions of people.

The first public apology video features Steve Harvey, an American comedian and talk show host, who hosted the pageant night of Miss Universe 2015 at Las Vegas, Nevada, USA. The video was posted in Youtube.com on December 21, 2015 after the mix-up done by the host as he awarded the wrong Miss Universe. After the most controversial event in the history of Miss Universe, Harvey met the press, apologized for what happened, and explained why he was not able to follow the cue card to announce the right winner.

The second public apology video, on one hand, features Toni Gonzaga, a famous TV actress and a host in the Philippines. She hosted Binibining Pilipinas 2015 together with another male actor during the pageant's coronation night at the Smart-Araneta Coliseum, Quezon City, Philippines. A number of Filipinos reacted on the alleged rude demeanor of the TV host towards the contestants as she tried to joke around during the nerve-wracking question-and-answer portion. Others commented that the jokes were sarcastic and that they were meant to offend the contestants. After the event, the public apology video of Gonzaga was posted in Youtube.com on March 18, 2015.

The comparability of both public apology videos could therefore be established, because of the similarity of the contexts of situations in which the speech act of apology was used. Moreover, the apology strategies and felicity conditions satisfied by the apology statements of the subjects could provide a clear-cut difference on how the language of public apologies is presented in both contexts of American and Philippine television.

3.2 Procedure

The apology strategies and felicity conditions in the public apology statements of the subjects of the present study were analyzed based on the transcriptions made from the videos downloaded from Youtube.com. Hence, to ensure validity of the data transcribed by the researchers, the

assistance of two intercoders was sought. The first one was a graduate of M.Ed-English and is currently teaching in a public secondary high school as an English 10 teacher. The second one is a head teacher in English and is currently taking up her PhD major in Educational Leadership studies.

The transcribed data were then converted as computer files to facilitate data analysis. First, the expressions used to apologize were counted and analyzed for each of the two statements. On the other hand, the apology strategies were studied using the framework proposed by Blum-Kulka & Olshtain (1984) which provides different categories of the manner by which an apologetic utterance is done. The framework is divided into six categories which include the IFIDs (Illocutionary Force Indicating Devices), explanation or account of the event, an excuse or justification, taking on responsibility, concern for the hearer, offer of repair, promise of forbearance, and the use of intensification. The apology strategies embedded in the statements were coded based on the given seven categories.

Finally, the felicity conditions presented in the apology statements of the American and Filipino subjects were analyzed using the classification proposed by Searle (1980) as cited in Toumi (2010). The felicity conditions for apologizing utilized in this study include the propositional content condition, preparatory condition, sincerity condition, and the essential condition. Once the apology statement fulfilled all the given conditions, the apology provided is then regarded as effective and successful (Toumi, 2010).

4. Results and Discussion

An expression of apology is intended to draw forgiveness and acceptance from the person or group to which the act is directed. Therefore, an apology can be broadly defined as consisting of the linguistic steps people take to rectify situations such as "violations" (Brasdefer, 2007). Crucial to the success of this speech act is the use of the right expressions and strategies and reference to important conditions that legitimize the need for a "genuine" apology. The following results and discussions reveal the apology expressions and strategies and felicity

American TV Host	Filipino TV Host
I apologize.	I'm humbly asking for an apology.

Table 3. Apology Expressions of the American TV Host and Filipino TV Host

conditions used in the public apology statements given by the American TV host and his Filipino counterpart, after rectifying and explaining faults committed during the Miss Universe 2015 and Binibining Pilipinas 2015 coronation nights, respectively.

4.1 Apology Expressions in American and Filipino Public Apology Statements

Complex speech acts like apologies actually consist of a set of routinized patterns or formulaic expressions typically used by native speakers of the language. Languages have certain words that are used to express an oral apology more than others (Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition, 2016). For example, in American English, "I apologize..." is found more in writing than it is in oral language. An expression of an apology can be intensified whenever the apologizer feels the need to do so. Such intensification is usually accomplished by adding intensifiers such as "really" or "very" – e.g., "I'm really sorry". Thus, whatever reasons a person has in giving the apology, expressions or word patterns would always accompany apologetic statements. Table 3 presents the apology expressions used in both public apology statements of the American TV host and Filipino TV host.

Based on the apology expressions used by the American TV host and the Filipino TV host, it could be drawn out that the presence of the household term "apologize" is common to both. Though "sorry" is considered as a common English expression for an apology, the two subjects still made use of the featured word to represent how apologetic they were with the people they believed they had caused damage to. In an article published in www.diffen.com, a website where different things are compared, it was reported that there is a subtle difference between saying "I'm sorry" and "I apologize". Further, it was described that saying sorry is more empathetic, remorseful, heartfelt, and is a truer admission of regret. In contrast, saying, "I apologize" counts as a formal

admission of wrongdoing. It may be expressed intellectually to mean regret or admission of a responsibility.

As regards, the apologetic expressions used by the subjects of the study and referring to the weight and contexts in which they were made, it can be noted that both of the subjects expressed their apologies in a more formal way by using the generic expression, "I apologize..." As such, in American English, the word "apologize" is generally used in written than in oral communication (Center for Advanced Research in

Categories	Extracts
A. Illocutionary Form Indicating Device (IFID)	
1. An expression of regret	It didn't deserve to happen. /It shouldn't have happened.
2. An offer of apology	I apologize.
3. A request for forgiveness	
B. Explanation or account, an excuse or justification	It wasn't in my earpiece. I walked all the way back and I was standing and reading the card, nobody actually was standing there, too. And I just kept reading the card, and it says first runner - up. I went, Oh my goodness! So, you know I came right now, I made a mistake.
C. Taking on responsibility	
1. Explicit self-blame	I made a mistake.
2. Lack of intent	It was an honest mistake.
3. Expression of - self deficiency	I didn't really know (first) the phone call. But I said, Miss Universe 2015 instead of saying first runner up; I read the name on the card.
4. Expression of embarrassment	I feel horrible for the two women, I feel horrible for the two countries. I feel horrible for the fans./I feel horrible I made a mistake.
5. Self-dispraise	
6. Refusal to acknowledge guilt	
6.1 Denial of responsibility	
6.2 Blame the hearer	
6.3 Pretend to be offended	
D. Concern for the hearer	I feel horrible for that young lady (Miss Colombia)...(applause)...I can only imagine that, that's a horrible feeling.
E. Offer of repair	...and all I could do was when I have that...when I started reading the card, is just turn back around and try to fix it...
F. Promise of forbearance	It has never happened before and it may not happen again...
G. Intensification (use of adverbials like 'very' with the IFID and the repetition of the IFID)	

Table 4. Apology Strategies Employed by the American TV Host

Language Acquisition, 2016). Also, this expression of apology is common among business correspondence letters where communication is also less personal. Hence, the subjects of the study may have chosen such word in order to establish a less personal relationship with the people they are asking apologies from. This may also give the idea that they may not be fully admitting the faults incurred during the incidents they were involved with. From the public apology videos of the two subjects, it is apparent that they couple apologies provided with logical defenses so as to diminish the genuineness of the speech act. Significantly, however, it is justifiable to consider that celebrity apologies have now become an art form. According to Hare (2015) of CNN, it seems that a successful celebrity apology involves more than just owning up to wrongdoing; it is not always what is said, but how and where the star (celebrity) says it.

4.2 Apology Strategies in American and Filipino Public Apology Statements

An apology is a face-threatening act (Brown and Levinson, 1987) that requires the speaker to admit the responsibility for some behavior (or failure to carry out some behavior) that has proven costly to the hearer. For Goffman (1971), an apology is in a sense, a remedial action that serves to maintain, restore and augment the interpersonal relationship. To note, the apology strategies employed by famous people in giving their public apologies as intertwined with the culture from where they are rooted, are worthy of research investigations. Research literature in pragmatics has been dominated mostly by the studies which address the ways the non-native speakers differ from the native speakers of the target language (Bardovi-Harlig, 2001), and this seems to be owing to the fact that native speakers of a language have been logically and traditionally regarded as the ideal reference of pragmatic knowledge and performance. Apologizing is therefore a speech act, where native speakers like Americans and speakers from the outer circles of World Englishes (Y. Kachru, 1997) like the Filipinos, could be contrastively studied. Tables 4 and 5 present the apology strategies employed by the American TV host and the Filipino TV host in their public

apology statements which lead to the discussions of their comparability.

Based on the apology strategies that are evident in the public apology statement of the American TV host, Steve Harvey, it can be seen that not all the categories of apology strategies in the coding scheme proposed by Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984) was utilized. Expressing regret and apology on the damage done by the host towards the two contestants of Miss Universe 2015, are both present in the apology statement. This indicates the acknowledgment of the host on the mistake he had done by crowning the wrong Miss Universe during the pageant's coronation night. This could be justified by the news reports in the United States wherein Harvey, in his self-titled talk show, tearfully apologizes to one of the "apologizees", Miss Colombia, Ariadna Gutierrez (Lawler, 2016). To quote from Harvey,

"You're the one person that the author really wanted to talk to. Because of the mistake author made, I cast you into a spotlight, a place that I never intended to. That I would not want to happen to anybody. I just want to say how sorry I am. I'm really -- I'm beyond sorry for what happened that night and that it was you."

The explanations given by the TV host were said to justify the reasons why he was not able to read the rightful owner of the Miss Universe 2015 crown. The second category signifies that the host of the said pageant admits that he committed a mistake, but did not intentionally do it. Accounts of what really happened during and after the mix-up explain is that, Harvey was in a state of confusion and that he immediately stood up for the mistake right after the wrong announcement. The propensity of the Americans to give explanations or accounts as they apologize is described in the study of Sugimoto (1997) on the apology styles of both Japanese and Americans. He concluded that U.S. Americans tend to include accounts in their apology. Further, it seems natural that U.S. American apology includes accounts. Moreover, U.S. Americans try to assure that the same offense will not take place again by emphasizing unusual circumstances which led to the offense (Sugimoto, 1997).

Steve Harvey took responsibility of the mix-up when he deliberately said that he made a mistake. However, he coupled his self-blame with words that show his lack of intent in doing so by saying that "It was an honest mistake". Another apology strategy that is congruent with Americans giving accounts or explanations when apologizing is their expression of self-deficiency. In the case of Steve Harvey, he mentioned that he did not hear the phone call which would actually tell him to rectify the wrong announcement. On one hand, what is interesting in the expressions relative with Harvey's taking in responsibility for what happened is the consistency of the expression of embarrassment all throughout his apology. At the beginning of his statement until the last, he emphasized that he felt horrible for what he did – to both contestants, the countries they are representing, and to the fans. On the other hand, there is no self-dispraise and refusal to acknowledge guilt (denial of responsibility, blame the hearer, and pretend to be offended) with the apology statement of Steve Harvey. This may be due to the fact that even at the beginning, he acknowledged responsibility of the mistake and that he admitted that it was his fault, why the announcement led to the embarrassment of the two contestants. The analysis of the apology strategies of the American TV host is somehow incongruent with the description given by Sugimoto (1997) about the styles of U.S. Americans in performing the speech act of apology. He stated that excessive self-humiliation is taken as a sign of the speaker's extremely low self-esteem, and could even embarrass the apology recipient. Thus, self-castigation in apology is not encouraged in U.S. American culture. Hence, this does not qualify one of the apology strategies of Harvey, as he explicitly blamed himself and even felt horrible for what the mix-up had brought. What Steve Harvey had done is therefore an account of the conception that people from an individual-agency culture (such as the United States) understand apologies as analytic mechanisms for assigning blame and re-establishing personal credibility (Maddux, 2010).

With the other strategies employed, it is apparent that Harvey had concern for the hearers, specifically the ladies

whom he humiliated during the pageant night, offered repair for what happened, and gave a promise of forbearance. After the controversial announcement was made, many netizens (citizens who use the Internet), celebrities around the world, and the contestant herself, Miss Colombia, posted messages and videos that they were extremely disappointed towards Harvey's actions. These may be one of the reasons why the American TV host himself assured the hearers that he felt horrible for the contestants, that he spoke up to correct things, and that

Categories	Extracts
A. Illocutionary Form Indicating Device (IFID)	
1. An expression of regret	
2. An offer of apology	I'm humbly asking for an apology.
3. A request for forgiveness	
B. Explanation or account, an excuse or justification	...because prior to the show, I was instructed.....ayon (That's it)! I was instructed po (Sir/Ma'am) to make the show fun, light, and ease the tension especially during the Q and A portion.
C. Taking on responsibility	
1. Explicit self - blame	
2. Lack of intent	So it was never my intention...
3. Expression of self-deficiency	
4. Expression of embarrassment	
5. Self-dispraise	
6. Refusal to acknowledge guilt	
6.1 Denial of responsibility	So it was never my intention, again, it was instructed for me to host that way...to make it lively and fun.
6.2 Blame the hearer	But it was never my intention...
6.3 Pretend to be offended	
D. Concern for the hearer	...to those who were not pleased and to those nasiyemprenagkaro onpo ng parang national debate kung nagustuhanpobanila o hindi nilanagustuhanangnapanoodnila, ahm...siyempredoonpomunasam gahindinatuwa(of course, there occurred a national debate if they liked or not what they had watched, ahm of course to those who did not like it) and hindinabigan angnapanoodnilanung (and was unhappy about what they had watched last) Sunday...
E. Offer of repair	
F. Promise of forbearance	
G. Intensification (use of adverbials like 'very' with the IFID and the repetition of the IFID)	I am <u>humbly</u> asking for an apology. I <u>really</u> and I <u>truly</u> appreciate that.... <u>very</u> nice and encouraging words

Table 5. Apology Strategies Employed by the Filipino TV Host

the same mistake won't happen again if he would still be hosting the Miss Universe pageant in 2016. Incongruence could be drawn from the way the American subject apologized on the basis of remediation and forbearance. According to Sugimoto (1997), U.S. Americans do not casually offer remediation (either direct reparation or indirect compensation) of damage, unless they are fully committed to such actions. Much the same can be said about their hesitation in promising not to repeat the same offense in the future. Not following through promised actions is looked down upon, and could further offend the recipient of the apology in the U.S. Hence, they will be better off not making such promises when apologizing. Steve Harvey's statement contradicted such assumption, for he acted on his mistake by constantly apologizing through the media and by even inviting the two contestants, Miss Philippines and Miss Colombia, to his talk show to personally give his apology.

The American TV host did not also use any intensifier or adverbials to couple his apology statement with. Though it is common for Americans to use intensifiers in their everyday speech (Romero, 2012), the result particularly deviates from such idea. One important consideration is the gender of the speaker in this particular instance. The American TV host as a male celebrity may have caused him not to include any intensifier in his statement since such practice is commonly associated with women. According to Jespersen (1959), the fondness of women to hyperbole will very often lead the fashion with regard to adverbs of intensity.

The apology strategies employed by the Filipino TV host, Toni Gonzaga, start with the Illocutionary Form Indicating Device (IFID) that brings in an offer of apology for the alleged sarcasm that she gave during the question-and-answer portion of Binibining Pilipinas 2015. She humbly asked for it instead of just saying she is sorry. However, two of the IFIDs in the coding scheme were not used. These are the expression of regret and request for forgiveness. This may be due to the context that if she had maligned anyone during the pageant night, she would want to offer an apology. Nevertheless, this was not the real scenario. The contestants of the said national pageant did not react

on the way Gonzaga hosted during the Q and A portion. Instead, other celebrities gave their comments on it, saying that it was rude of her to crack jokes while the contestants were nervous thinking about their answers. The seminal study of Bautista (1987) on apology strategies used in Filipino radio dramas, confirms that Filipinos have the tendency to give explicit acknowledgment of the need to apologize. Hence, this was seen in the apology strategy used by the Filipino TV host in this study. However, this tendency was negated in an article written in *Qatarliving.com* (2013). According to the writer of the article, Filipinos may resist all efforts to a reconciliation. Because of the Filipino "amorpropio" or ego-defensiveness, it is very difficult for them to surrender their pride. It is noticeable that most Filipinos find it difficult to say the word "sorry". It is better for them to act tough ("matigas") rather than say sorry because to do the same is to sacrifice their precious pride.

The Filipino TV host also gave accounts or explanations behind her way of hosting the pageant. She justified that it was actually requested by the pageant committee – for the Q and A portion to be lively and fun, and that it was never her intention to offend anyone especially the contestants. This apology strategy is also present in both the studies of Bautista (1987) and Oclaret (2013) on the apology strategies used in Filipino radio dramas and those observed by Filipino and Filipino-Chinese students, respectively. On another note, a strategy that was found by Mojica (2004) on the apology strategies used by Filipino-speaking couples can be associated with the purpose of the TV host to indirectly involve the pageant committee with the way she did her hosting of the pageant. This is therefore an attempt to transfer guilt either to the offended party or in the case of the Filipino TV host, other subjects under discussion by way of explanation.

As regards the strategy of taking in the responsibility, the Filipino TV host only made use of two instances under the refusal to acknowledge guilt category – denial of responsibility and blame the hearer. She did not use expressions to show explicit self-blame, self-deficiency, expression of embarrassment, and self-dispraise, and pretend to be offended, since she clarified beforehand

that she was instructed to host that way. This is justified by her use of apology strategies that refer to her defense against the blame such as her lack of intent in humiliating the contestants and her denial of the responsibility, including her implicit intention to blame the hearer for how they had interpreted her actions. This is in contrast with the results of the study of Oclaret (2013) when he found out that Filipino high school students generally use the strategy of taking in responsibility when expressing an apology. This category was also seen among the apology statements of the Filipino-Chinese student-respondents.

Another strategy that was apparently used by the Filipino TV host is her concern for the hearers. As transcribed from her statement, she wanted to pacify the people who are commenting badly about her actions by giving them an apology and a logical explanation. However, though it is categorized under concern for the hearer, this may also relate with the reconciliatory statement and transfer of guilt described in the study of Mojica (2004). At first, the statement of Gonzaga may sound as a form of reconciliation with the viewers who did not like her antics, but this may also reveal her purpose of transferring the guilt to these viewers because of their misinterpretations and judgments about her way of hosting which was in the first place, allowed by the organizers of the beauty pageant. Hence, this may be a strategy that could both benefit the apologizer and the hearer or, in the case of the Filipino TV host, the apologizer alone.

An offer of repair and promise of forbearance on one hand, were not satisfied in the apology statement of the Filipino TV host. This may be due to the fact that there was no mistake done, but a misinterpretation of the actions she had performed. Since the "alleged" offensive hosting of Binibining Pilipinas 2015 was done because of the request of the pageant committee, the host may have thought that there is nothing to have reparation about neither a promise of forbearance to be given. Hence, such strategies may only be done when a social norm was violated and if the apologizer wishes for forgiveness (Olshtain & Cohen, 1983).

Consequently, the use of more intensifiers of the Filipino TV host in her public apology statement leads to the

Felicity Conditions	Public Apology Statement (American TV Host)	Public Apology Statement (Filipino TV Host)
Propositional Content Condition	I would like you to know. I feel horrible for this young woman. I feel horrible for the fans. I feel horrible I made a mistake...	I'm humbly asking for apology kung I'vel have offended or I have maligned or I have hurt anyone of you.
Preparatory Condition	The American TV host announces the wrong winner which led to the humiliation of the contestant who was mistakenly crowned.	The "alleged" sarcastic and humiliating actions of the Filipino TV host towards the candidates of a national beauty pageant.
Sincerity Condition	...it may not happen again	
Essential Condition	The TV host informed the audience right after the mix-up that something went wrong with the announcement of winners.	

Table 6. Felicity Conditions Fulfilled in the Public Apology Statements of the American TV Host and the Filipino TV Host

contention that such practice is relative to gender. According to Stofel (1901), the use of intensifiers is so common in feminine speech and is characteristic of women due to the fact that ladies are notoriously fond of hyperbole.

4.2.1 Similarities and Differences in the Apology Strategies Used by the American TV Host and Filipino TV Host

Generally, the similarities and differences on the apology strategies of both American and Filipino subjects of the study may relate to the cultural relativity that exists between the statements of the apologizers on the bases of the speech communities represented, American and Filipino television contexts. Though the severity and nature of the mistake or fault of the two subjects strongly influence the apology strategies they employed, still, a clear-cut representation of how apologizing is realized among American and Filipino celebrities could be underscored. Significantly, the more empathetic and congenial way of asking for an apology reflects the American way of trying to point out the bright sides of the situation in their apologies. Further, when they are doing it so, they may be genuinely trying to make the "apologizee" feel better as they believe emphasizing negative aspects of the situation would only depress and further aggravate the "apologizee" (Sugimoto, 1997). For the Filipino subject, giving a public apology would also

entail defending oneself and clarifying reasons of a certain action. Aside from the clear justifications and defense the Filipino host had provided, the inclusion of the strategy that indirectly puts the blame to the hearer is also evident. As such, Mojica (2004), in her study of apologies used by Filipino-speaking couples, stated that the Filipino subjects have the tendency to transfer guilt either to the offended party or to the subject under discussion by way of explanation.

4.2.2 Felicity Conditions in the Public Apology Statements of the American TV Host and Filipino TV Host

In order to “do things with words,” certain things must be true of the context in which speech acts are uttered. In other words, a sentence must not only be grammatical to be correctly performed; it must also be felicitous. According to the University of Pennsylvania (2001), there are three generally considered types of felicity conditions. The first one is the preparatory conditions, such as that the person performing the speech act has the authority to do so, the conditions on the manner of execution of the speech act, and the sincerity conditions, necessary in the case of verbs like “apologize” and “promise”. In the following discussion, another condition was included, the essential condition, which the speaker undertakes to inform a bad event (Searle, 1980 as cited in Toumi, 2010). Table 6 presents the felicity conditions satisfied in the statements of the American and Filipino TV hosts on the basis of apologizing.

Based on the felicity conditions fulfilled in the apology statements of the two subjects, it is clear that all necessary conditions were satisfied by the American TV host. On one hand, two of the four conditions were satisfied by the Filipino TV host. As regards the propositional content condition, both of the subjects expressed polite statements in offering their apology. However, on this premise, more politeness and candor could be associated with the expression of the Filipino TV host because of her use of an intensifier. The American's statement of apologetic expression is more direct. According to Ancarno (2011), in his study of newspaper representations of public apologies in British and French, it is important to stress that the overt media presuppositions

play a significant role in shaping the representation of successful public apologies. This, however, is different from the means by which public apologies were given in the present study. Spoken apology is said to be more performative and natural than a written one.

For the second condition, preparatory condition, both of the subjects had the authority to apologize. Also, the participants were in the correct state to have the act performed on them, since the “apologizees” – the contestants and the audience, respectively – reacted negatively on the mistakes or faults committed by the two TV hosts. Conversely, though it is common for humans to apologize, in the study of Toumi (2010), it was found that students were not actually familiar with the speech act of apologizing. He therefore arrived at the assumption that the data reflect that students do not use this category of speech acts largely in dealing with each other in everyday communication.

The promise of not committing again the same mistake or fault which constitutes sincerity condition, was only satisfied in the apology statement of the American TV host. After all, it was objectively found that Steve Harvey really did commit a mistake by crowning the wrong Miss Universe 2015 winner. This calls for a sincerity condition since he admitted the mistake and corrected it right away. In contrast, in the case of the Filipino TV host, she did not fully admit that she humiliated the pageant contestants, but just clarified the explanation behind her actions. This does not guarantee any sincerity condition. Hence, when sincerity conditions are not fulfilled, the speaker does not intend what he or she says. In the case of apologizing, it may be impossible to know how sincere the speaker is. Moreover, sincerity, as a genuine intention, is no assurance that the apologetic attitude will last (Moore, 2001).

For the last condition, the essential condition, only the American TV host's statement satisfied it. The night when he committed the biggest mistake in the history of Miss Universe, Steve Harvey stood up after the wrong announcement and corrected his mistake. He first informed the audience that there was a mistake and that the need to correct it had to be done. This is in view of the

first apology that he had during the worldwide airing of Miss Universe 2015. For the Filipino TV host, aside from deliberately denying responsibility, she also did not inform the audience about the event. Instead, her apologetic statements were also meant to clarify the issue and to clear her name.

It is clear that the American TV host made a more felicitous public apology statement as compared to his Filipino counterpart. A sincere communicative intention of apologizing could therefore be traced from the statement of the former. The question of who made a more successful and felicitous apology is then answered by the fact that the American TV host sounded more apologetic than the Filipino TV host. After all, a felicitous speech may be measured on the communicative intention made by the speaker through the use of appropriate utterances (Chilton & Schaffner, 1984).

Conclusion

This pragmatic study puts forward the significant similarities and differences on the apology strategies employed and felicity conditions satisfied in the public apology statements of two TV hosts from the United States and the Philippines. Further, the analysis of the similarities and differences on how the two subjects performed the speech act of apologizing provides revelations on how contexts of situations and unique speech communities influence the speaker's way of producing apologies. The following conclusions may be drawn from this study:

First, the apology strategies employed and felicity conditions satisfied in public apologies involving television celebrities may be influenced by the severity of the fault committed by the "apologizer". If the apology was made to rectify the mistake done by the speaker, then, apology strategies would sound more empathetic, sincere, and would fulfill necessary felicity conditions. This is evident in the public apology statement of the American TV host. On one hand, if one of the purposes of apologizing is to clarify an issue and to clear the name of the "apologizer", then apology strategies would be less prevalent and felicity conditions are weaker. For this matter, the apology that came from the Filipino TV host fulfills this assumption. The influence of context on the production of apologies is

therefore claimed by Gruber (2014). In her book, "I'm Sorry for What I have Done: The Language of Courtroom Apologies", she mentioned that the discursive constraints imposed by a particular context can also affect the content of an apology.

Second, public apology strategies made by TV personalities in both the United States and the Philippines may also be governed by specific styles distinct in both speech communities. For the American TV host, the recurrence of self-blame, self-embarrassment, and a more empathetic apology statement leads to the assumption that Americans often try to point out bright sides of the situation in their apologies, for they genuinely try to make the other feel better (Sugimoto, 1997). Americans also have the tendency to include accounts or explanations in their apologies. On one hand, the Filipino TV host was more self-justifying and showed explicit lack of intent and denial of responsibility in her apology statement. This may lead to the assumption that the host's asking of an apology is also a way to clear her name about the issue. The presence of a clear justification of her actions relate to the said purpose. On another note, it was also found that the Filipino TV host made use of a strategy which Mojica (2004) describes as an attempt to transfer guilt to the hearer or the "apologizee". Also, the Filipino TV host purposively expressed gratitude towards her supporters which may be viewed as a way to weaken or counter the negative issue she was involved with. Finally, the use of more intensifiers by the Filipino TV host, a woman, as compared to the American, a man, may be made clear on the basis of gender. As reported by Romero (2012), women generally prefer to use more hyperboles and intensifiers when they orally communicate.

Third, felicity conditions in public apology statements of celebrities may not be strongly influenced by culture, but by the intention and nature of the fault committed by the speaker. In connection with the subjects of the study, all felicity conditions were satisfied in the apology statement of the American TV host, while only two from the four conditions were satisfied in the apology statement of the Filipino TV host. This may be due to the purpose of the American to sincerely say sorry for the mistake incurred

and the intention of the Filipino to apologize – not to feel “sorry” about what she did, but to give explanation on what happened to make the audience understand her actions.

Finally, the limited number of corpora of public apology statements analyzed in this study may not be considered as entirely representative of the way Americans and Filipinos use apology strategies and fulfill felicity conditions in such speech act. Hence, using a larger corpus for the same study or considering other pragmatic elements that affect the performance of the featured speech act may effectively validate or justify the conclusions made.

References

- [1]. Al Ali, S. (2012). “A cross-cultural study of the speech act of apology by Saudi and Australian females”. (Unpublished masters' thesis), The University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia.
- [2]. Ancarno, C. (2011). “Press representations of successful public apologies in Britain and France”. Retrieved from https://www.reading.ac.uk/web/FILES/english-language-and-literature/ell_language_5_Ancarno_vol_3.pdf
- [3]. Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do Things with Words*. London: Oxford University Press.
- [4]. Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2001). “Evaluating the empirical evidence: Grounds for instruction in pragmatics”. In Kasper, G., & Rose, K. (Eds.), *Pragmatics and language Teaching*, (pp.11-32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [5]. Bataineh, R.F., & Bataineh, R.F. (2005). “American university students' apology strategies: An intercultural analysis of the effect of gender”. *Journal of Intercultural Communication*, Vol. 9.
- [6]. Bautista, M. L. S. (1987). “Apologies, compliments, directives, and probes: An exploratory analysis of Pilipino speech acts”. In M. L. S. Bautista (Ed.), *Readings in Philippine Sociolinguistics*, (pp.139-157). Manila: De La Salle University Press.
- [7]. Bergman, M. L., & Kasper, G. (1993). “Perception and performance in native and nonnative apology”. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage Pragmatics*, (pp. 82-107). New York: Oxford University Press.
- [8]. Bieber, J. (2015). *Sorry*. Retrieved from <http://www.metrolyrics.com/sorry-lyrics-justin-bieber.html>
- [9]. Blum-Kulka, S. (1984). “Interpreting and performing speech acts in a second language: a cross-cultural study of Hebrew and English”. In N. Wolfson and J. Elliot (Eds.), *TESOL and Sociolinguistic Research*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- [10]. Blum-Kulka, S., & Olshtain, E. (1984). “Requests and apologies: A cross-cultural study of speech act realization patterns (CCSARP)”. *Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 5, No. 3, pp. 196-213.
- [11]. Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (Eds.). (1989). *Cross-cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies*. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex.
- [12]. Brasdefer, C. F. (2007). *Speech Acts: Apologies*. Retrieved from http://www.indiana.edu/~discprag/spch_apologies.html
- [13]. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [14]. Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition @ University of Minnesota, (2016). *American Apologies*. Retrieved from <http://carla.umn.edu/speechacts/apologies/american.html>. (pp. 155-173) Nerweed, New Jersey :Ablex.
- [15]. Chilton, P. & Schaffner, C. (1984). *Politics as Text and Talk: Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse*. John Benjamins Publishing.
- [16]. Cohen, A., & Olshtain, E. (1981). “Developing a measure of Sociocultural competence: The case of apology”. *Language Learning*, Vol. 31, No. 1, pp. 113-34.
- [17]. Cunningham, M. (1999). “Saying sorry: The politics of apology”. *The Political Quarterly*, Vol. 70, pp. 285-293.
- [18]. Diffeen.com (n.d.). *I'm sorry vs. I apologize*. Retrieved from http://www.diffeen.com/difference/I_Am_Sorry_vs_I_Apologize
- [19]. Dinu, A. (2012). *Pragmatics*. Retrieved from http://www.unibuc.ro/prof/dinu_a_d/docs/2012/mar/01_

08_07_50pragmatica2.pdf

- [20]. Fraser, B. (1981). "On apologizing". In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *Conversational Routine: Explorations in Standardized Communication Situations and Prepatterned Speech* (pp. 259-271). New York: Mouton.
- [21]. Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- [22]. Goffman, E. (1971). *Relations in Public: Microstudies of the Public Order*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- [23]. Gruber, M. C. (2014). *I'm Sorry for what I've done: The language of Courtroom Apologies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [24]. Hare, B. (2015). *Celebrity apologies: The Good, Bad and Uncomfortable*. Retrieved from <http://edition.cnn.com/2014/06/09/showbiz/celebrity-news-gossip/celebrity-apologies-best-worst-uncomfortable/>
- [25]. Holmes, J. (1990). "Apologies in New Zealand English". *Language in Society*, Vol. 19, No. 2, pp. 155-199.
- [26]. Istifci, I. (2009). "The use of apologies by EFL learners". *CCSE English Language Teaching Journal*, Vol. 2, No. 3, pp. 15-25.
- [27]. Jacobsson, M. (2002). "Thank you and thanks in Early Modern English". *ICAME Journal*, Vol. 26, pp. 63-80.
- [28]. Jespersen, O. (1959). *Language: Its nature, development, and Origin*. 11th impression. London: Allen and Unwin.
- [29]. John. E. (1976). Sorry Seems to be the Hardest Word. Retrieved from http://www.lyricsfreak.com/e/elton+john/sorry+seems+to+be+the+hardest_20807608.html
- [30]. Kachru, Y. (1997). "Culture and argumentative writing in World Englishes". In L.E. Smith, & M.L. Forman (Eds.), *World Englishes 2000*, (pp. 48-67), Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- [31]. Kissine, M. (2014). *From utterances to Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [32]. Lawler, K. (2016). *Steve Harvey Tearfully Apologizes to Miss Colombia*. Retrieved from <http://www.usatoday.com/story/life/people/2016/01/19/steve-harvey-apologizes-miss-colombia-ariadna-gutierrez/78995170/>
- [33]. Maddux, W. W. (2010). *Cultural Differences in the Function and Meaning of Apologies*. Retrieved from <https://www.kellogg.northwestern.edu/~media/Files/Research/>.
- [34]. Mamiverse.com, (2015). *12 Excuses we make to Avoid saying 'I'm sorry'*. Retrieved from <http://mamiverse.com/excuses-forgiveness-sorry-59674/>.
- [35]. Márquez-Reiter, R. (2000). *Linguistic Politeness in Britain and Uruguay: A Contrastive Study of Requests and Apologies*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- [36]. Mojica, L. (2004). "Apology strategies perceived to be appropriate by Filipino-speaking couples". *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*, Vol. 34, pp. 27-40.
- [37]. Moore, A. (2001). *Pragmatics and speech acts*. Retrieved from <https://www.teachit.co.uk/armoore/lang/pragmatics.htm>
- [38]. Nobles, M. (2003). "Official apologies and their effects on political membership in democracies". Paper presented at the *American Political Science Association Meeting*, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- [39]. Oclaret, V. N. (2013). "Apology strategies of Filipino and Filipino-Chinese third year high school students". (Unpublished research paper), Philippine Normal University – Manila, Manila, Philippines.
- [40]. Olshtain, E., & Cohen, A. D. (1983). "Apology: A speech-act set". In N. Wolfson & E. Judd (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and Language Acquisition*, (pp. 18-35). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- [41]. Olshtain, E. (1989). Apologies across languages. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* pp. 155-173.
- [42]. Qatarliving.com (2013). *Negative Filipino Values*. Retrieved from <http://www.qatarliving.com/forum/family-life-qatar/posts/negative-filipino-values>.
- [43]. Romero, S. (2012). *This is so cool! A comparative Corpus Study on Intensifiers in British and American English*. Retrieved from <https://tampub.uta.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/84065/gradu06287.pdf?sequence=1>.
- [44]. Searle, J. R. (1979). *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- [45]. Searle, J. R. (1980). "What Is a Speech Act?" In Pugh, A. K. Leech, J. V., & Swann, J. (Eds.), *Language and Language Use*, pp. 312-327. London: Heirman Educational Book in association with the Open University Press.
- [46]. Stoffel, C. (1901). *Intensives and Down-toners*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- [47]. Sugimoto, N. (1997). "A Japan-U. S. comparison of apology styles". *Communication Research*, Vol. 24, No. 4, pp. 349-269.
- [48]. Toumi, I. (2010). "Students' awareness of felicity conditions and their attitudes towards the application of felicitous speech acts: The case of Master One English students". (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation), University of Constantine, Constantine, Algeria.
- [49]. Trosborg, A. (1987). "Apology strategies in natives/non-natives". *Journal of Pragmatics*, Vol. 11, No. 2, pp. 147-167.
- [50]. Trosborg, A. (1995). *Interlanguage Pragmatics: Requests, Complaints and Apologies*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- [51]. University of Pennsylvania, (2001). *Linguistics 001 – Lecture 13 on Pragmatics*. Retrieved from http://www.ling.upenn.edu/courses/Fall_2000/ling001/pragmatics.html
- [52]. Youtube.com, (2015a). *Miss Universe 2015 – Steve Harvey Apologizes in Press Conference*. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=u2AyPYfErMY>.
- [53]. Youtube.com (2015b). *Toni Gonzaga Apologized*. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9fjtlby-OXM>

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

John Paul Obillos Dela Rosa is currently pursuing his PhD in Linguistics with Specialization in Applied Linguistics studies at the Philippine Normal University, Manila, the National Center for Teacher Education in the Philippines. He is a Secondary School English Teacher I at Dapdap High School, Department of Education, Province of Tarlac, Philippines. His research interests include Contrastive Rhetoric, Second Language Acquisition, Sociolinguistics, and English Language Teaching



Lorna Bacani Castro is presently a Secondary School English Teacher I at Dapdap High School, Department of Education, Province of Tarlac, Philippines. She is a graduate of Master of Arts in Education Major in Educational Management at the University of St. La Salle, Bacolod City, Philippines. Her research interests include English Language Studies, Sociolinguistics, and Corpus Linguistics.

